

10.0 Effects Found Not To Be Significant



10.0 EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

The City of Long Beach conducted an *Initial Study* in December to determine significant effects of the project. In the course of this evaluation, certain impacts of the project were found to be less than significant because a project of this scope could not create such impacts or the project has no characteristics producing effects of this type. The effects determined not to be significant are not required to be included in primary analysis sections of the Draft EIR. In accordance with *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15128, the following section provides a brief description of potential impacts found to be less than significant. A copy of the *Initial Study* is found in Appendix 15.1, *Initial Study and Notice of Preparation*.

AESTHETICS. *Would the proposal:*

- a) *Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

Less Than Significant Impact. Scenic resources along Ocean Boulevard include the ocean, port facilities and oil islands. Views from the project site include the Harbor and Queen Mary. There are no designated scenic vistas located within or adjacent to the project site. Project implementation would be subject to the PD-30 zoning regulations including setbacks, height requirements and building design, resulting in less than significant impacts.

- b) *Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?*

Less Than Significant Impact. According to the *General Plan*, no officially designated State scenic routes or highways occur near the project site. The proposed project site is located adjacent to Ocean Boulevard, which is designated as a recreational, historical-cultural and bicycle scenic route in the Scenic Routes Element of the *General Plan*. The project proposes a mixed-use development with residential, ground floor retail, art gallery, and civic space uses. As stated, project implementation would be subject to the PD-30 zoning regulations including setbacks, height requirements and building design, resulting in less than significant impacts.

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. *In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:*

- a) *Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?*



No Impact. The project site is urbanized and is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Project implementation would not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.

b) *Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?*

No Impact. Implementation of the project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract. The project site is zoned Downtown Planned Development (PD-30) allowing for a mix of residential and commercial uses.

c) *Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?*

No Impact. The proposed project does not involve changes in the existing environment that could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural uses. The project site is urbanized and there are no farmland uses that are occurring on-site or in the immediate vicinity.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) *Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

No Impact. The project site is predominately urbanized and built-out. Landscaping within the area consists of both native and non-native vegetation and no species that are candidate, sensitive or special status species are known to exist in the local vicinity due to the urbanized conditions. The proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts to Federal or State listed or other designated species.

b) *Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

No Impact. As previously stated, the project site is predominately urbanized and built-out. No riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities exist on-site. According to the Conservation Element of the *General Plan*, riparian habitat within the City is limited along streams and flood channels, where disturbance is minimal. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

c) *Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, costal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?*

No Impact. No federally protected wetlands occur on-site. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any impacts in this regard.



- d) *Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?*

No Impact. No migratory wildlife corridors or native wildlife nurseries exist in the project area. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any impacts in this regard.

- e) *Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance.*

No Impact. The project site is comprised of both native and non-native vegetation and does not include protected habitat. Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources. No impacts would occur in this regard.

- f) *Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?*

No Impact. The project site does not have an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other habitat conservation plan. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts in this regard.

CULTURAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*

- b) *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is predominately urbanized with land area having been previously disturbed. As part of the *Historic-Period Building Survey* (refer to Section 5.7, Cultural Resources) a records search was conducted by the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) at the California State University in Fullerton. The records search included an examination of maps and records on file for previously identified archaeological resources in or near the project area and existing cultural resources reports pertaining to the vicinity. SCCIC records indicate a number of area-specific cultural resources studies covering various tracts of land. As a result of these previous studies and a 1988 survey conducted in the downtown area, several previously recorded historical/archaeological sites were identified within the scope of the records search. All of these sites dated to the historic period, and included one archaeological site consisting of a trash scatter. However, none of the archaeological sites are located within the project site.

No archaeological or paleontological resources are known to occur on-site and, due to the level of past disturbance, it is not anticipated that archaeological or paleontological resource sites exist within the project area. Should evidence of archeological or paleontological resources occur during grading and construction, operations would be required to cease and a qualified archaeologist would be contacted to determine the appropriate course of action.



- c) *Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?*

Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to Response (b), above.

- d) *Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?*

Less Than Significant Impact. No known human remains occur on-site and due to the level of past disturbance, it is not anticipated that human remains exist within the project site. In the event human remains are encountered during earth removal or disturbance activities, all activities would cease immediately and a qualified archaeologist and Native American monitor would be immediately contacted. The Coroner would be contacted pursuant to Sections 5097.98 and 5097.99 of the Public Resources Code relative to Native American remains. Should the Coroner determine the human remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission would be contacted pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS. *Would the project:*

- a) *Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:*
- 1) *Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.*

Less Than Significant Impact. No active faults are known to traverse the project site and the project site is not located within, or immediately adjacent to an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Therefore, rupture of a known earthquake fault would not occur within the project area. Adherence to standard engineering practices and design criteria relative to seismic and geologic hazards in accordance with the *Uniform Building Code* (UBC) is required.

- 2) *Strong seismic ground shaking?*

Less Than Significant Impact. No known faults exist within the project area. However, active faults within the City of Long Beach occur along the Newport-Inglewood Fault Zone. The Newport-Inglewood Fault Zone is a fault system consisting of a series of echelon fault segments and folds. Active or potentially active faults of the Newport-Inglewood Fault Zone include the Cherry Hill Fault, the Northeast Flank Fault and the Reservoir Hill Fault. Additionally, the Palos Verdes Fault, located approximately 4.5 miles southwest and offshore of the City, is considered an active fault. The project site would experience ground shaking from earthquakes generated along active faults located off-site. The intensity of ground shaking would depend upon the magnitude of the earthquake, distance to the epicenter and the geology of the area between the epicenter and the project site.



Adherence to standard engineering practices and design criteria relative to seismic and geologic hazards in accordance with the UBC would reduce the significance of potential impacts.

3) *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is located within the area of the City identified in the Seismic Safety Element of the *General Plan* as having minimal potential for liquefaction. However, the project would be required to submit a soils report to the City addressing seismic hazards, including liquefaction and/or landslides for review and approval by the City. Adherence to the findings of the project soils report, including design recommendations, would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

4) *Landslides?*

No Impact. The project site is characterized by relatively flat topography. Project implementation is not anticipated to expose people or structures to landslides. As stated, the project would be required to submit a soils report to the City addressing seismic hazards, including liquefaction and/or landslides for review and approval by the City. Adherence to the findings of the project soils report, including design recommendations, would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

b) *Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?*

Less Than Significant Impact. Grading and trenching for construction may expose soils to short-term wind and water erosion. Implementation of erosion control measures as stated in Chapter 18.95 of the *Municipal Code* and adherence to all requirements set forth in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for construction activities would reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels.

c) *Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in an on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site has not been identified as a geologic unit that is unstable, and based upon available references, would not become unstable as a result of project implementation. Development would be subject to site-specific geotechnical analysis and would be designed in compliance with applicable building codes, reducing impacts to a less than significant level.

d) *Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is not located on expansive soil. The *General Plan* identifies the project area as consisting of predominately granular non-marine terrace deposits overlying Pleistocene granular marine sediments at shallow depths. This deep marine section is composed of interbedded units of sandstone, siltstone and shale. The near surface soils on the terrace consist



predominately of cohesionless soils such as sand, silty sand and sandy silt that are generally medium to very dense. Cohesive soils such as clayey silt and silty clay, although less dominant are also present as layers in these surficial deposits. The consistency of these units is described as ranging from stiff to hard. Development would be subject to site-specific geotechnical analysis and would be designed in compliance with applicable building codes, reducing impacts to a less than significant level.

- e) *Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?*

No Impact. It would not be necessary to install septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. No impact would occur in this regard.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. *Would the project:*

- a) *Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?*
- b) *Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?*

Less Than Significant Impact. As determined in the Initial Study, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Additional analysis is provided in Section 5.6, Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

- c) *Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?*

No Impact. The project site is not located within one-quarter mile of any existing or proposed schools. No impacts would occur in this regard.

- e) *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*

No Impact. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of an airport. The nearest airport is Long Beach Airport, approximately four miles northeast of the project site. No impacts would occur in this regard.



- f) *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*

No Impact. Refer to Response (e), above.

- g) *Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The project proposes vacating Lime Avenue between Medio Street and Ocean Boulevard and relocating the existing Bronze Way alley northward to the edge of the project site. However, the project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. According to the Public Safety Element of the *General Plan*, emergency response and evacuation procedures would be coordinated through the City in coordination with the police and fire departments, resulting in less than significant impacts; refer also to Section 5.8, *Public Services and Utilities*.

- h) *Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?*

No Impact. The project site and surrounding areas are predominately built-out and no wildlands occur within or adjacent to the project site. Future development, as a result of project implementation, would introduce additional ornamental landscaping, which is not anticipated to create hazardous fire conditions. No impacts would occur in this regard.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. *Would the Project:*

- b) *Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is urbanized and adjacent areas are predominately built-out. Implementation of the project would not cause a significant increase of impervious surfaces and therefore would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. The project is consistent with current conditions in the area. Impacts would be less than significant.

- c) *Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?*

Less Than Significant Impact. As previously stated, the project site is currently developed and adjacent areas are predominately built-out. The project area does not contain any streams or rivers. The amount of impervious surfaces would not be significantly altered as a result of project implementation. Additionally, project



implementation would not significantly alter the existing drainage pattern of the area resulting in substantial erosion or siltation on-site or in the project vicinity. The project would be required to submit hydrology and hydraulic calculations showing the drainage pattern and slopes for review by the City. Less than significant impacts would occur in this regard.

- d) *Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?*

Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to Response (c), above.

- g) *Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?*

Less Than Significant Impact. According to the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), Community Panel Number 060136 0020 C, July 6, 1998, published by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), the project is located within *Other Areas Zone X*. *Other Areas Zone X* is defined as "Areas determined to be outside 500-year flood-plain." Thus, significant impacts are not anticipated in this regard.

- h) *Place within a 100-year flow hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows.*

Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to Response (g), above.

- i) *Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?*

Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to Response (g), above.

- j) *Inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?*

Less Than Significant Impact. According to Plate 11 of the Seismic Safety Element of the *General Plan*, Tsunami and Seiche Influence Areas, the project is not located within an area of the City susceptible to tsunami and seiche. Table 4, of the Seismic Safety Element of the *General Plan*, Seismic Hazard Evaluation By Seismic Response Area, identifies the project as being located in an area with remote potential for tsunami and seiche hazards. Thus, less than significant impacts are anticipated in this regard.

LAND USE AND PLANNING. *Would the project:*

- a) *Physically divide an established community?*

Less Than Significant Impact. According to the General Plan, the project site is located within designated Land Use District (LUD) No. 7, Mixed Use District. LUD



No. 7 is intended for use in large, vital activity centers. Land uses intended for the district include employment centers, such as retail, offices and medical facilities; higher density residences; visitor-serving facilities; personal and profession services; or recreational facilities. The project site serves as an entrance to the East Village Arts District and the eastern edge of downtown Long Beach. As a result, the project proposes the removal of residential, retail, restaurant, office and parking uses to allow for a mixed-use development with high-rise residential and ground floor retail, art gallery, café and civic space uses, serving as an extension of downtown Long Beach and the East Village Arts District. Development of the site as proposed, would provide higher density residential uses in proximity to existing retail, office, entertainment and transit uses and would not divide an established community. Thus, significant impacts are not anticipated in this regard.

- c) *Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?*

No Impact. As previously stated, the project does not conflict with habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans.

MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- a) *Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?*

No Impact. Oil is the primary mineral resource within the City of Long Beach. The project site is not currently utilized for oil extraction and oil extraction would not occur as a result of project implementation. No impacts to mineral resources are anticipated in this regard.

- b) *Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?*

No Impact. The *General Plan* does not identify the project site as an important mineral resource recovery site. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

NOISE. Would the project result in:

- e) *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?*

No Impact. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, project implementation would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.



- f) *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?*

No Impact. The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Exposure of people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels is not anticipated as a result of project implementation.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. *Would the project:*

- c) *Result in change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?*

No Impact. Due to the nature and scope of the proposed land uses, project implementation would not affect air traffic patterns and would not result in safety risks.

- d) *Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?*

Less Than Significant Impact. Project implementation would not involve the construction of new roadways. However, the project proposes vacating Lime Avenue between Medio Street and Ocean Boulevard and relocating the existing Bronce Way alley northward to the edge of the project site. Access to the project site would be required to comply with all City design standards, which would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level; refer also to Section 5.8, *Public Services and Utilities*.

- e) *Result in inadequate emergency access?*

Less Than Significant Impact. As stated, the project proposes vacating Lime Avenue between Medio Street and Ocean Boulevard and relocating the existing Bronce Way alley northward to the edge of the project site. However, the project would not physically interfere with emergency access to the project site. According to the Public Safety Element of the *General Plan*, emergency response and evacuation procedures would be coordinated through the City in coordination with the police and fire departments, resulting in less than significant impacts; refer also to Section 5.8, *Public Services and Utilities*.

- g) *Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?*

Less Than Significant Impact. No conflicts with any adopted policies supporting alternative transportation modes such as bus facilities and bicycle access/parking are anticipated to occur. The project proposes to locate residential, ground floor retail, art gallery, café and civic space uses in proximity to existing public transportation.